



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/822,120	04/09/2004	Mark D. Levitt	117-P-1345USD2	2471
23322	7590	03/29/2005	EXAMINER	
IPLM GROUP, P.A.			AHMED, SHEEBA	
POST OFFICE BOX 18455			ART UNIT	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55418			PAPER NUMBER	
			1773	

DATE MAILED: 03/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/822,120	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LEVITT ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Sheeba Ahmed	<b>Art Unit</b> 1773	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1/4/05, 1/10/05, 2/22/05.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 and 31-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 and 31-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/22/05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

*ll*

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

1. The amendments submitted in the above-identified application on January 4, 2005 have been entered. Claims 1, 10, 11, 31, 32, 35 and 36 have been amended.

**Claims 1-19 and 31-40 are pending.**

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-19 and 31-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hamrock et al. (WO 98/11168).

Hamrock et al. disclose a floor finishing system comprising a radiation curable composition and a primer composition wherein the primer composition is coatable over a substrate and the radiation curable composition is coatable thereon (Page 6, lines 25-30). The radiation curable coating comprises a polyfunctional isocyanurate and a hydroxyalkyl acrylate (Page 4, lines 21-30). A preferred monomer is shown on Page 5 and contains an aromatic group (*thus meeting the limitations that the topcoat composition comprises an acrylated urethane or an aromatic urethane*). The cured, coatable composition is readily strippable from the substrate when the latex primer is present (Page 7, lines 1-3). In applying the coating compositions of the

Art Unit: 1773

invention to a suitable substrate, it is preferred that the composition be applied in a manner which creates a coating no greater than about 1.3 mm in thickness (Page 18, lines 29-31). With regards to the stripability rating limitations recited in claims 7 and 16, the Examiner takes the position that such property limitations must be inherently present in the coatings taught by Hamrock et al. given that the chemical composition of the coatings and the structure of the laminate as taught by Hamrock et al. and as claimed in the instant application is identical. All limitations of the claimed invention are either disclosed or inherent in the above reference.

3. Claims 1, 5, 7, 9-11, 15, 16, 31-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lauer et al. (US 5932,350).

Lauer et al. (US 5,932,350) disclose a method for tandem coating substrate, such as cellulosic substrates, with both highly crosslinked thermoset coatings and aqueous based coatings (Column 1, lines 1-9). The substrate may be coated first with the cured coating (ii) and then the highly crosslinked coating (i) which is preferably formed from a thermoset material that is UV curable and which before cure may be a high solids composition or a waterborne composition (Column 2, lines 31-51). The UV curable coatings, after exposure to UV radiation, produce highly crosslinked coatings. It has proved difficult to adhere water-based topcoats without the use of an intermediate coating (Column 3, lines 1-6). With regards to the stripability rating limitations recited in claims 7 and 16, the Examiner takes the position that such property limitations must be inherently present in the coatings taught by Lauer et al. given that the chemical

Art Unit: 1773

composition of the coatings and the structure of the laminate as taught by Lauer et al. and as claimed in the instant application is identical. All limitations of the claimed invention are either disclosed or inherent in the above reference.

4. Claims 1-5, 7-12, 15-19 and 31-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wang et al. (US 5,494,707).

Wang et al. disclose a resilient floor covering comprising of a resilient support surface and a resilient wear surface adhered to said support surface and comprising an underlying wear layer based coat and an overlying wear layer top coat adhered to said wear layer base coat (Column 3, lines 61-68). The wear layer top coat is a hard thermoset UV curable blend of acrylates (Column 4, lines 7-10). The wear layer base coat has a thickness of 0.7 to 3.0 mils and the wear layer top coat has a thickness of 0.1 to 0.5 mils (Column 8, lines 35-45). Conventional substrate layer comprises materials typical of substrate layers found in the flooring art and include vinyl compositions (Column 9, lines 59-66).

### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments, filed on January 4, 2005, with respect to the rejection of claims 1-5, 7, 9-12, 15, 16, 18, 19, and 31-38 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bolgiano et al. (US 4,421,782) have been fully considered and are deemed persuasive. Hence, the rejection of claims 1-5, 7, 9-12, 15, 16, 18, 19, and 31-38 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bolgiano et al. (US 4,421,782).

Art Unit: 1773

has been withdrawn.

On the other hand, Applicant's arguments filed on January 4, 2005 regarding the rejection of claims 1-19 and 31-40 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hamrock et al. (WO 98/11168) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 1-19 and 31-40 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hamrock et al. (WO 98/11168) and submit that the Hamrock fails to teach a two-part curable overcoat. However, the Examiner would like to point out that the patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process." In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985). The structure implied by the process steps has been be considered when assessing the patentability of the claims over the prior art, and the Examiner takes the position that the use of a two-part composition does not impart distinctive structural characteristics to the final product. Hence, this rejection is maintained.


### ***Conclusion***

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sheeba Ahmed whose telephone number is (571)272-1504. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays and Thursdays from 9:30am to 6:00pm.

Art Unit: 1773

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carol Chaney can be reached on (571)272-1284. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Sheeba Ahmed  
Art Unit 1773  
March 21, 2005